UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/517,813	12/14/2004	Bertrand Bouvet	4976-004	8614

22429 7590 04/14/2009
LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP
1700 DIAGONAL ROAD
SUITE 300
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER	
KIM, TAE K	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2453	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/14/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/517,813	BOUVET, BERTRAND	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	TAE K. KIM	2453	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 January 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *33-66* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *33-66* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to the Applicant's response filed on January 21, 2009. Claim 33 has been amended by the Applicant. Claims 65 and 66 have been added by the Applicant. Claims 33 – 66, where Claims 33, 65, and 66 are in independent form, are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

1. Claims 33, 65, and 66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The newly amended limitation, "...the first database being stored by a domain name server, referred to as a DNS server, or a directory server, referred to as an LDAP server, able to be accessed indirectly from a the DNS server..." is not supported by the specification. As currently amended, the DNS server can be directly used to consult or modify the ENUM records. However, the claim further states "a protocol manager for seeking, from the domain name, the IP address of the server storing the said first database and, according to the operation, for transmitting to the server a request to read or update the ENUM record by

indirection in the LDAP dynamic directory of said LDAP server." The existence of the LDAP dynamic directory is not required when only the DNS server is used [See Fig. 11].

To clarify, the LDAP server must exist in the system for the claimed functionality of the "protocol manager" to "transmit to the server a request to read or update the ENUM record by indirection in the LDAP dynamic directory."

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 33, 65, and 66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claim states "a protocol manager for seeking, from the domain name, *the IP address of the server storing the said first database* and, according to the operation, for transmitting to the server a request to read or update the ENUM record by indirection in the LDAP dynamic directory of said LDAP server" without specifically describing which server corresponds to the IP address that the protocol manager is seeking.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on January 21, 2009 have been fully considered but they are moot based on the new grounds of rejection as stated below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 33 – 43, 51, 52, 58, 61 – 63, 65, and 66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 7,277,421, invented by Paul Barry Pershan (hereinafter "Pershan").

3. Regarding Claims 33, 65, and 66, Pershan discloses a system for consulting and/or updating an ENUM record associated with at least one subscriber of a service provider for managing telecommunication resources [Figs. 1 and 5; Col. 6, Lines 8-14; Col. 11, lines 11-16; ENUM used to obtain desired information from a database and users can update the information in the ENUM database with a temporary IP address so that calls are directed to the user's current location], said ENUM record being stored in a first database, the ENUM record including one or a plurality of resource records [Fig. 1, item 158; ENUM database], the first database being stored by a domain name server, referred to as a DNS server [Fig. 5; Col. 17, lines 40-57; ENUM database incorporated into existing Internet DNS], or a directory server, referred to as an LDAP server, able to be accessed indirectly from the DNS server, said DNS server and said directory server belonging to said service provider [Fig. 5; Col. 17, lines 40-57; ENUM database incorporated into existing Internet DNS], the system further comprising:

a communication arrangement for enabling the said system to receive from a telecommunication terminal a request for consultation and/or modification of the ENUM record or a programming of such a request [Figs. 1 and 5; Col. 11, Lines 2-25];

a controller for determining, from said consultation and/or modification request transmitted to the said system or previously programmed in the said system, a domain name and an operation to be performed on the ENUM record [Figs. 1, 2, and 5; Col. 12, lines 23-60; the SCP (controller) retrieves the Local Routing Number (domain name) associated in the LNP database with the called telephone number and generates a call control message for the IP gateway switch];

a protocol manager for seeking, from the domain name, the IP address of the server storing the said first database [Figs. 1 and 5; Col. 17, line 2 - Col. 18, line 15; the ISCP (protocol manager) uses a Get-Data function to establish a link to the ENUM database to retrieve call party information], e.g. IP address and, according to the operation, for transmitting to the server a request to read or update the ENUM record by indirection in the LDAP dynamic directory of said LDAP server [Figs. 1 and 5; Col. 17, line 2 - Col. 18, line 15; the ISCP (protocol manager) uses a Get-Data function to establish a link to the ENUM database to retrieve call party information via a proxy server (LDAP server)].

4. Regarding Claim 34, Pershan discloses all the limitations of Claim 33 above. Pershan further discloses of an authenticator for authenticating, at the application level, the sender of the request from authentication information stored in a second local or remote database [Col. 15, lines 11-25; caller information can also contain security/screening information].

5. Regarding Claim 35, Pershan discloses all the limitations of Claim 34 above. Pershan further discloses that the protocol manager is arranged to respond to an

indication of the sender of the request having been authenticated by (a) transmitting a consultation request according to the DNS protocol to the DNS server, the request having as its argument the domain name, and (b) receiving a first response from the said server [Col. 15, lines 37-45; gateway switch may be instructed by the ISCP to terminate the call without forwarding the call to the VOIP network].

6. Regarding Claim 36, Pershan discloses all the limitations of Claim 35 above. Pershan further discloses that the controller is arranged to store the first database by the DNS server by (a) extracting from the first response information contained in the record and (b) formatting the information in order to transmit the information to said terminal via the communication arrangement [Figs. 1 and 5; Col. 17, line 2 - Col. 18, line 15].

7. Regarding Claims 37 – 39, Pershan discloses all the limitations of Claim 35 above. Pershan further discloses that the LDAP server is arranged to store the first database, the controller being arranged to extract the address of the LDAP server from the first response, wherein the protocol manager is arranged to transmit a consultation request according to the LDAP protocol to the LDAP server and to receive a second response from the LDAP server and the controller is arranged to extract from the second response information included in the record and to format it for transmission to the terminal via the communication arrangement [Figs. 1 and 5; Col. 17, line 2 - Col. 18, line 15; the use of ENUM in conjunction with SIP as a way for a PSTN based device to obtain information in a VOIP network].

8. Regarding Claims 40 – 43, Pershan discloses all the limitations of Claims 36 and

39 above. Pershan further discloses that the controller is arranged to respond to an updating operation determined by the controller to instruct the protocol manager to transmit an update request according to the DNS protocol [Col. 11, lines 12-16; ENUM database with a temporary IP address so that calls are directed to the user's current location]. Additionally, Pershan discloses that the protocol manager is arranged to receive an updating confirmation/invalidation response from the DNS server and the controller is arranged to format the updating confirmation/invalidation response before ordering transmission of the updating confirmation/invalidation response to the terminal via the communication arrangement [Figs. 1, 3, and 5; Col. 15, lines 37-45; Col. 17, line 2 - Col. 18, line 15; ISCP can instruct the gateway switch to terminate the call and forward the calling party to another device to indicate the reason the call cannot be completed]. Furthermore, the use of LDAP protocol and servers to implement such a system is disclosed by Pershan [Figs. 1 and 5; Col. 17, line 2 - Col. 18, line 15; the use of ENUM in conjunction with SIP as a way for a PSTN based device to obtain information in a VOIP network].

9. Regarding Claim 51, Pershan discloses all the limitations of Claim 33 above. Pershan further discloses that the protocol manager is arranged to use a DNS protocol of the secure type [Col. 15, Lines 11-25; security information can be included].

10. Regarding Claim 52, Pershan discloses all the limitations of Claim 33 above. Pershan further discloses that the system comprises an STN and/or ISDN interface for connecting the said communication arrangement to the STN/ISDN network [Fig. 1; Col. 17, lines 19-23; PSTN based device used to communicate with VOIP device].

11. Regarding Claim 58, Pershan discloses all the limitations of Claim 33 above. Pershan further discloses that the system comprises an IP interface [Figs. 1 and 5; Col. 17, line 2 - Col. 18, line 15; the use of ENUM in conjunction with SIP as a way for a PSTN based device to obtain information in a VOIP network].

12. Regarding Claims 61 – 63, Pershan discloses all the limitations of Claim 33 as stated above. Pershan further discloses that the controller is arranged to determine a domain name from a subscriber identifier that is the E.164 telephone number of the subscriber [Col. 11, lines 10-11] to extract information and to determine according to the request an operation to be performed on a resource record of the Naming Authority Pointer [Col. 11, Lines 2-11].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 53 – 57 and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pershan.

13. Regarding Claim 53, Pershan discloses all the limitations of Claim 52 above. However, Pershan does not expressly disclose the use of a voice synthesis module or a

voice file reproduction module for generating a voice menu that recognizes DTMF signals and/or voice choices in the voice menu.

It is well known to those skilled in the art at that time the application was filed that a voice synthesis module or a voice file reproduction module can be used for generating a voice menu reproducing one or more items of information on the recorded voice form. It is also well known that a recognition module for DTMF signals and/or a voice recognition module are used to recognize a choice from the voice menu. It would be obvious to use a voice menu to retrieve data through a telephone to allow consultation or modification of the database without the need of a live operator answering these requests.

Applicant has failed to seasonably challenge the Examiner's assertions of well known subject matter in the previous Office action(s) pursuant to the requirements set forth under MPEP §2144.03. A "seasonable challenge" is an explicit demand for evidence set forth by Applicant in the next response. Accordingly, the claim limitations the Examiner considered as "well known" in the first Office action, i.e. a voice menu using a voice synthesis module or a voice file reproduction module along with a DTMF signal and/or voice recognition module to provide an automated telephone interface for a user, are now established as admitted prior art of record for the course of the prosecution. See In re Chevenard, 139 F.2d 71, 60 USPQ 239 (CCPA 1943).

14. Regarding Claims 54 and 55, Pershan discloses all the limitations of Claim 52 above. However, Pershan does not expressly disclose the use of videotext or SMS messaging to consult or modify the record stored in the database.

It is well known to those skilled in the art at that time the application was filed that videotex can be used for managing a menu to enter a request for consultation or modification of the record and to reproduce one or more items of information about the record or an update confirmation/invalidation response. It is also well known that SMS messages can be used to transmit and receive information. Either would be obvious deviations of the various other methods of consulting or modifying the database disclosed in Call, such as email, website, and telephone.

Applicant has failed to seasonably challenge the Examiner's assertions of well known subject matter in the previous Office action(s) pursuant to the requirements set forth under MPEP §2144.03. A "seasonable challenge" is an explicit demand for evidence set forth by Applicant in the next response. Accordingly, the claim limitations the Examiner considered as "well known" in the first Office action, i.e. the use of videotex and SMS messaging to consult or modify records within a database, are now established as admitted prior art of record for the course of the prosecution. See In re Chevenard, 139 F.2d 71, 60 USPQ 239 (CCPA 1943).

15. Regarding Claim 56, Pershan discloses all the limitations of Claim 52 above. Pershan further discloses of a communication arrangement comprises a user-to-user information (UUI) sending/receiving module, for receiving, in the form of an item of UUI, a request for consultation or modification of the record and to transmit in the form of an item of UUI, one or more items of information about the record or an updating confirmation/invalidation response [Fig. 1; Col. 17, lines 19-23; PSTN based device used to communicate with VOIP device].

16. Regarding Claim 57, Pershan discloses all the limitations of Claim 52 above. However, Pershan does not expressly disclose the use of a fax module to transmit information.

It is well known to those skilled in the art at the time the application was filed that using a fax module to transmit information between two communication points. Using a fax module is an obvious deviation of using many of the other common communication methods disclosed in Call, such as email, regular mail, and telephone. Allowing the system to communicate through a fax module allows the vendors to use another common method known at the time of the invention.

Applicant has failed to seasonably challenge the Examiner's assertions of well known subject matter in the previous Office action(s) pursuant to the requirements set forth under MPEP §2144.03. A "seasonable challenge" is an explicit demand for evidence set forth by Applicant in the next response. Accordingly, the claim limitations the Examiner considered as "well known" in the first Office action, i.e. the use of a fax module to transmit information, are now established as admitted prior art of record for the course of the prosecution. See In re Chevenard, 139 F.2d 71, 60 USPQ 239 (CCPA 1943).

17. Regarding Claim 64, Pershan discloses all the limitations of Claim 33 above. However, Pershan does not expressly disclose that the system stores data of the A, NS, MD, MF, CNAME, SOA, MB, MG, MR, NULL, WKS, PTR, HINFO, MINFO, MX, or TXT type.

It is well known in the art at the time the application was filed that this list of query names (A, NS, MD, MF, CNAME, SOA, MB, MG, MR, NULL, WKS, PTR, HINFO, MINFO, MX, or TXT) are all file types that are used by the DNS lookup tool to convert IP addresses to hostnames and vice versa and to obtain aliases. It is obvious to one skilled in the art that the use of one or many of these query types is an obvious deviation of the process of looking up an IP address via a DNS.

Applicant has failed to seasonably challenge the Examiner's assertions of well known subject matter in the previous Office action(s) pursuant to the requirements set forth under MPEP §2144.03. A "seasonable challenge" is an explicit demand for evidence set forth by Applicant in the next response. Accordingly, the claim limitations the Examiner considered as "well known" in the first Office action, i.e. the use of A, NS, MD, MF, CNAME, SOA, MB, MG, MR, NULL, WKS, PTR, HINFO, MINFO, MX, or TXT as file types within a system containing a DNS, are now established as admitted prior art of record for the course of the prosecution. See In re Chevenard, 139 F.2d 71, 60 USPQ 239 (CCPA 1943).

Claims 44 – 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pershan in view of U.S. Patent 5,862,325, invented by Drummond Shattuck Reed et al. (hereinafter referenced as "Reed").

18. Regarding Claims 44 – 47, Pershan discloses all the limitations of Claim 33 as stated above. However, Pershan does not specifically disclose that the controller is arranged to store in the second database a configuration profile transmitted via the communication arrangement, the profile including one or more programmed

modification requests, each programmed modification request being associated with at least one time range and/or one geographical area. Nor does Pershan disclose that the system comprises of a configuration automatic controller for scrutinizing the second database and testing whether a measurement of time belongs to the range and/or a location of the terminal belongs to the area, and, in response to a positive result, extracting the associated programmed modification request and transmitting to the protocol manager a request to consult the first database.

Reed discloses applying rules into the operational functionality of databases that makes them capable of initiating communications and database processing based on time, system variables, system events, or other conditions [Col. 21, Lines 33-39]. Reed further discloses that these rules are associated with methods to be executed when these conditions are met, such as backing up the database after X days [Col. 21, Lines 45-61]. Furthermore, it is well known in the art at the time the application was filed that having processes conditioned upon a specific event or variable must be stored or programmed into the system to be triggered. It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to apply the use of rules within the system disclosed in Pershan to effectively process database retrievals or modifications. Certain conditions, such as holiday sales, temperature changes, or interest rate changes, can have an effect on the data that is stored within a database and the ability to have such programmed requests decreases the amount of user interface necessary to change the information stored in the database.

Claims 48 – 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pershan, in view of Reed, and in further view of U.S. Patent 5,590,274, invented by Michael J. Skarpelos et al. (hereinafter referenced as "Skarpelos").

19. Regarding Claims 48 and 49, Pershan, in view of Reed, discloses all the limitations of Claim 47 as stated above. However, Pershan does not specifically disclose the storing of each confirmation/invalidation response from the first server into another database as a history file that can be accessed by authorized entities through a report transmitted to those who requested such history.

Skarpelos discloses of a system and technique to record and monitor changes to the database [Col. 1, Lines 25-30]. This system and technique is not just used in a fault tolerant system to revert back to a previous setting, but also used to view the history of changes to the database [Col. 1, Lines 25-26]. It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to record the changes into the database to trace back to prior modifications if there were any errors in the database. Additionally, the ability to revert back to previous data within the database when there are failures during the updating process is necessary to prevent the loss of important data.

20. Regarding Claim 50, Pershan, in view of Reed, and in further view of Skarpelos, discloses all the limitations of Claim 49 above. However, Pershan, in view of Reed and Skarpelos, does not expressly disclose that a history report of the database will be sent to a notification terminal.

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the application to use the email confirmation process disclosed in Pershan to transmit the history data of the

database at the request of a user. The system in Pershan encompasses all the required components necessary to store history data in another database, authenticate where the request is coming from, and to send a report to the requestor. Again, the ability to revert back to previous data within the database when there are failures during the updating process is necessary to prevent the loss of important data.

21. Regarding Claims 59 and 60, Pershan discloses all the limitations of Claim 33 above. Pershan further discloses the system includes various intelligent peripherals that can be used to collect information from a user [Col. 8, lines 36-38]. Pershan, however, does not specifically disclose the use of web servers or an SMTP server to communicate with the subscriber.

Call discloses the use of web pages for an authentication form (Col. 6, Lines 10-12; registration template accepted via HTML web page form) and a form for entering a request for consultation or modification of said record, representing one or more items of information about the record or an updating confirmation/invalidation response in the form of web pages (Col. 6, Lines 10-12; web template also used to modify information in database; Col. 22, Liens 61-63; the use of a browser by an online shopper to view information within database). Additionally, Call discloses that the communication arrangement comprises of an SMTP server for receiving, in the form of e-mails, a request for consultation or modification of the record and for transmitting in the form of e-mails one or more items of information about the record and/or an updating confirmation/invalidation response (Col. 6; Lines 12-13 and 26-31; email can be used to

submit registration information and confirmation can be required by responding to a predetermined email sent to the registered email address).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Call within the Pershan system since the VOIP system is IP based and has the accessibility of various intelligent peripherals that can be used to collect and relay information. The motivation to do so is to provide multiple ways for a subscriber to interact with the VOIP calling system where a device other than a standard PSTN device is used.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

The Examiner point out that the reference(s) used in the prior art rejection must be considered as a whole. The Examiner has cited particular figures, columns, line numbers, and/or paragraphs in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well.

Contacts

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tae K. Kim, whose telephone number is (571) 270-1979. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (8:00 AM - 5:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne, can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for submitting all Official communications is (703) 872-9306. The fax phone number for submitting informal communications such as drafts, proposed amendments, etc., may be faxed directly to the examiner at (571) 270-2979.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at (866) 217-9197 (toll-free).

/Tae K. Kim/
Examiner, Art Unit 2453

April 10, 2009

/Moustafa M Meky/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2457